United Nations A/C.2/59/SR.40

General Assembly
Fifty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
24 January 2005

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 40th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 16 December 2004, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Balarezo ..... (Peru)

Contents

Agenda item 84: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 87: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Agenda item 88: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 89: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*)

Agenda item 83: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

(d) Commodities (*continued*)

Agenda item 90: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

(b) Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

Organization of work

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

04-64881 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Agenda item 84: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (A/C.2/59/L.4 and L.69)

1. **Mr. Bernardini** (Italy), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.69, which he was submitting on the basis of informal negotiations held on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.4. The Monterrey Consensus was still very much a live issue, and that was why it had been so difficult to arrive at the consensus text currently before the Committee. He hoped it would be adopted also by consensus.

2. **Mr. Mbayu** (Cameroon), speaking as facilitator of the negotiations on the draft resolution, said that the following revisions should be made: in paragraph 5, the phrase "while welcoming" should be replaced by the word "welcomes"; in paragraph 17, the initial phrase "*Reiterates* the commitment" should be replaced by the word "*Decides*".

3. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.69, as orally revised, was adopted.*

4. **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, observed that the meeting of world leaders referred to in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution had strengthened the collective commitment to combat poverty and hunger, but that the United States opposed some of the ideas presented at that meeting for financing that commitment, such as the call for global taxes, which it deemed to be an affront to the democratic principle that elected Governments were given the authority to tax their people, and a contravention of each country's right to decide how to raise funds for official development assistance (ODA).

5. Though essential, ODA was in fact a relatively small component of the total public, private, domestic and external resources for development, and the Monterrey Consensus should not be invoked to advance the idea that the main obstacle to development was a lack of new schemes to raise funds for ODA. Furthermore, the United States did not accept international aid targets based on percentages of the gross national product (GNP) of donor countries. On the other hand, it believed that aid should be increased to those developing countries making a demonstrated commitment to govern justly, invest in their people and promote entrepreneurship. The United States had already fulfilled — three years early — the pledge it had made at the International Conference on Financing for Development to increase ODA by 50 per cent over 2000 levels, and since 2003 it had continued to raise the levels. The 0.7 per cent target bore no relationship to demonstrated need or the ability of recipients to use aid effectively.

6. **Mr. van Loosdrecht** (Netherlands), thanking the delegation of Cameroon for having facilitated the negotiations and produced a miracle where none had seemed possible, observed that he had worked in a great cause: the draft resolution just adopted was a significant component of the follow-up to the Monterrey Consensus.

7. **Mr. Al-Mahmoud** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that it set great store by the draft resolution just adopted, and thanked all delegations which had helped to reach a consensus.

8. **The Chairman** said that he shared the general satisfaction at the adoption of an important text.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.4 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 87: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Draft resolutions on the role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (A/C.2/59/L.20 and L.68)

10. **Mr. Bernardini** (Italy), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.68, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.20. The eighth preambular paragraph should be revised by insertion of the words "and public sector" before the word "governance".

11. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.68, as orally revised, was adopted.*

12. **Mr. Lazo-García** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that, while he had joined the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, his Government believed that the course that globalization had thus far

taken had — rather than providing opportunities for the developing countries to expand their economies or improve their living standards — been a factor in polarizing rich and poor countries and deepening the social exclusion that created hunger and poverty. Globalization had fostered a growth model based on a regressive worldwide distribution of income and had been detrimental to the development of peoples.

13. **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America) said that the draft resolution just adopted contained much that was positive, such as the recognition of the importance of the role of the private sector and entrepreneurship. However, the United States was concerned that the draft continued to cast globalization in a negative light, whereas globalization was a neutral force. Yet it also represented an enormous opportunity for countries to join in the new possibilities for trade and exchange of ideas. The United States believed that countries that had good governance, solid democratic institutions, a respect for the rule of law and sound regulatory policies and that invested in their human capital were best placed to take advantage of globalization.

14. **Mr. Rojas** (Chile) said that globalization was an established fact and the process would thenceforth affect all nations. All countries must therefore take an active part in giving it a more human and inclusive dimension, in which development was a central element and the welfare of peoples was guaranteed.

15. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.20 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 88: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

Draft resolutions on the Third United Nations Conference on Least Developed Countries (A/C.2/59/L.42 and L.71)

16. **Mr. Abreha** (Ethiopia), Rapporteur, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.71, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.42, and said that the following revisions should be made: in the paragraph 5, the word "General" should be inserted after the phrase "the provisions of"; and in paragraph 8, after the words "Member States" the words "*and invites*" should be inserted, and the final phrase "to the Trust Fund" should be replaced by the phrase "to that trust fund".

17. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.71, as orally revised, was adopted.*

18. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his Government welcomed the decision to conduct a comprehensive review of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries during the sixty-first session of the General Assembly, for it would be a good opportunity to assess the progress made and the areas in which further efforts were needed. In the interest of efficiency, Japan wished to suggest some modalities relating to the budget for the review: existing budgetary lines should be reviewed at the sixtieth session, so that the Secretariat could then present Member States with a budget containing truly essential elements within existing resources. On that basis, there should then be a discussion on how to finance the budget for the review.

19. **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America), endorsing the statement of the Japanese delegation, said that her delegation looked forward to discussing the modalities for the comprehensive review scheduled to take place at the sixty-first session. It asked the Secretariat to provide guidance in the planning process to ensure that the review was organized in the most cost-effective way; and to ensure further that the cost of the review was included within existing resources when the United Nations budget was drawn up.

20. **Mr. Gupta** (Canada) said that his delegation recognized the importance of carrying out a mid-term review of the Brussels Programme of Action in 2006. It should be conducted as indicated in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution just adopted, and also within existing resources.

21. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.42 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 89: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

Draft resolution on the importance of further strengthening efforts towards achieving the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, in the promotion of peace (A/C.2/59/L.56)

22. **Mr. Ramadan** (Lebanon), Vice-Chairman, said that, while all the delegations and groups concerned had expressed their willingness to discuss the linkages between strengthening efforts to achieve the internationally agreed development goals and the promotion of peace, there had not been sufficient time to achieve a consensus on such a serious and complex issue. He thanked all delegations and groups that had participated in the negotiating process.

23. **Mr. Al-Mahmoud** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, consented to the withdrawal of the draft resolution. The Group of 77 and China had agreed on a text that would not jeopardize future discussions of the issue during the sixtieth session. It was regrettable that, owing to the lack of time and the complexity of the issue, it had not been possible to achieve a consensus. The Group of 77 and China firmly believed that peacebuilding was closely connected to the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals and that it was within the Second Committee's province to adopt a draft resolution on the mutually enforcing relationship between peace and development. Such a resolution would have an impact on the work of the relevant United Nations funds and programmes and be a further incentive for all Member States to participate in efforts to strengthen peace.

24. It was particularly important to provide assistance towards achieving the internationally agreed development goals in order to meet the very special needs of countries emerging from conflict. The Group of 77 and China hoped that the matter would be discussed at the sixtieth session and that the United Nations funds and programmes would deepen their commitment to integrating the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals into all peace efforts.

25. **Ms. Grindlay** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada, expressed regret that the draft resolution would have to be withdrawn at a time when the interrelationship between peace and development was increasingly topical. The Committee's failure to agree on a text was disappointing. Australia and Canada hoped that the issue would be revisited during the sixtieth session and looked forward to working constructively with partners when that happened.

26. **Mr. van Loosdrecht** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had also welcomed the draft resolution and would have been open to discussing it. Conflict was indeed a great impediment to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. That point had recently been stressed in the report of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) on *The State of the World's Children 2004* and would undoubtedly be an important topic at the 2005 summit to review the United Nations Millennium Declaration.

27. **Mr. Rojas** (Chile) said that his delegation, too, regretted the withdrawal of the draft resolution and the failure to achieve a consensus, since the Economic and Social Council had a vital long-term role to play in programmes for countries in conflict, particularly Haiti.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.56 was withdrawn.*

(a) **Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006)** (*continued*)

Draft resolutions on the implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (A/C.2/59/L.50 and L.72)

29. **Mr. Ramadan** (Lebanon), Vice-Chairman and facilitator of the negotiations, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.72, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.50. The consensus achieved — after 11 rounds of informal meetings and additional consultations — would have been impossible without the flexibility and serious commitment of the delegations concerned. He drew attention to the addition of the following paragraph 33 bis:

> "*Encourages* Governments to support the UN-HABITAT Global Campaign for Secure Tenure and the Global Campaign on Urban Governance as important tools for, inter alia, promoting administration of land and property rights, in accordance with national circumstances;

and enhancing access to affordable credit by the urban poor,".

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.72, as orally revised, was adopted.*

31. **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America) said that, while the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it was disappointed at its lack of balance. The draft largely repeated language from previous years. Resolutions should be judged on whether or not they contributed something new or important that would help eradicate poverty; in all likelihood, the draft resolution before the Committee did not.

32. While the draft resolution was quite specific in its call for reform of the international system, it barely mentioned domestic-policy requirements for poverty eradication. In that connection, the Secretary-General's Commission on the Private Sector and Development had recently released important findings and recommendations on realizing the potential of entrepreneurship and competitive markets as a means of providing goods, services, jobs and income to the poor. As stressed in the report, however, those findings and recommendations, while not new, were often ignored.

33. A serious and balanced resolution on poverty eradication would have welcomed the Commission's findings and encouraged Member States, United Nations funds and programmes and regional organizations to act upon them. Many developing countries and countries with economies in transition were indeed acting upon them or achieving growth and overcoming poverty. A balanced resolution would have also lauded the fact that approximately 75 per cent of the world's population lived in countries that were on track to meet the internationally agreed development goal on poverty reduction, an important and positive fact that the draft resolution ignored.

34. The United States understood the term "right to development" to mean that each individual should enjoy the right to develop his or her intellectual or other capacity to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of civil and political rights.

35. In joining the consensus on the draft resolution, the United States welcomed the World Leaders Summit on Action against Hunger and Poverty as an event that had helped to renew and strengthen the collective commitment of the international community to combat those scourges. However, the United States had opposed, and continued to oppose, some of the ideas presented at the Summit for financing the commitment, including the call for global taxes, for reasons already set out in its statement with regard to financing for development.

36. Her delegation reaffirmed that it did not accept international aid targets based on the percentage of donors' gross national product. It did believe, however, that aid should be increased to those developing countries making a demonstrated commitment to governing justly, investing in their people and promoting enterprise and entrepreneurship.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.50 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 83: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

Draft resolutions on international trade and development (A/C.2/59/L.25 and L.25/Rev.1)

38. **Mr. Al-Mahmoud** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25, on which the Group of 77 and China had had numerous informal discussions with their partners in the past few weeks. The Group of 77 and China had entered the negotiations in a positive spirit with a view to arriving at a consensus text; however, despite numerous substantial concessions on their part, even with regard to previously agreed formulations, no progress had been achieved and the draft resolution was at a standstill. The Group of 77 and China expressed their appreciation and gratitude to those delegations which had shown the necessary flexibility with the aim of achieving a consensus and moving the process forward. The draft resolution represented an important means of expressing developing countries' views on international trade and development, and was one of the most significant the Group of 77 and China had submitted to the Committee. The Group of 77 and China were of the view that the Committee should take action on it.

39. **Mr. Maksimychev** (Russian Federation) said that, if the Committee would be considering draft

resolution A/C.2/59/L.25 rather than draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25/Rev.1, he would need additional time to consult his capital.

40. **Mr. Gupta** (Canada), supported by **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America), said that, while his delegation desired an expeditious conclusion of the Committee's work, it understood that certain delegations needed to consult their capitals and would agree to defer consideration of the draft resolution.

41. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) also agreed but pointed out that, according to the *Journal* for that day, the Committee was supposed to consider draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25/Rev.1, not draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25.

42. **Mr. Al-Mahmoud** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, agreed to defer consideration to the following day.

43. **Mr. Rojas** (Chile) and **Mr. Essel** (Ghana) requested clarification as to whether the Committee would be taking action on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25 or draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25/Rev.1.

44. **The Chairman** said that, when the Group of 77 and China had been unable to obtain a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25/Rev.1, they had requested that action should be taken on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.25.

45. He took it that the Committee wished to defer action on the draft resolution until the following day in order to give the delegation of the Russian Federation and others sufficient time to consult their capitals.

46. *It was so decided.*

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

Draft resolutions on the international financial system and development (A/C.2/59/L.2 and L.70)

47. **Mr. Ramadan** (Lebanon), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.70, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.2. He thanked the delegations concerned, in particular the delegation of Guyana, for their efforts and announced the following revisions: in the second preambular paragraph, a comma should be added after "Financing for Development"; in paragraph 3, the words "Also notes the" should be replaced by "Takes note of"; and in paragraph 16, "inter alia" should be replaced by "including". He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.70 was adopted.*

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.2 was withdrawn.*

(d) Commodities (*continued*)

Draft resolution on commodities (A/C.2/59/L.26/Rev.1)

50. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.26/Rev.1.

51. **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America) said that her delegation wished to request a recorded vote on paragraph 12 of the draft resolution.

52. **Mr. Barnwell** (Guyana) said that, in paragraph 16 of the draft resolution, the word "invites" should be added before "international financial organizations".

53. **Mr. Al-Mahmoud** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the Group of 77 and China attached great importance to agenda item 83 (d). During the fifty-eighth session, the Secretary-General had submitted the report of the Meeting of Eminent Persons on Commodity Issues (A/58/401) and extensive high-level discussions had also been held, including the open-ended panel on commodities chaired by the President of the General Assembly along with other key United Nations bodies taking follow-up action. The evolving process on commodities had been encouraging and the Group of 77 and China felt that the best way of implementing existing agreements was through consensus.

54. It was widely accepted that urgent measures were needed to ensure the ongoing contribution of the commodity sectors to poverty eradication and attainment of the Millennium Development Goals. Paragraph 12 of the draft resolution reflected the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010, the previously agreed language of paragraph 20 of General Assembly resolution 58/197 on international trade and development, and collective efforts to eradicate poverty. Paragraph 42 of the Doha Declaration also referred to the Brussels Programme of Action.

55. The international community had fully acknowledged in the Brussels Programme of Action

that responsibility for implementing policies conducive to fostering growth and reducing poverty in the least developed countries was a shared one. The request for a vote on paragraph 12 of the draft resolution implied that the millions of people living in poverty were doing so out of choice. The Group of 77 and China urged all members to vote in favour of the paragraph in question.

56. **Mr. Aho-Glele** (Benin) said that his delegation wished to know why the delegation of the United States had requested a vote on paragraph 12 of the draft resolution.

57. **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote against paragraph 12 of the draft resolution. Her delegation had made clear throughout negotiations that it would not support any language that attempted to distort the mandate for the Doha Round or prejudge issues under negotiation there. The paragraph in question did distort that mandate. Paragraph 42 of the Doha Declaration was very clear and called for "duty-free, quota-free market access for products originating from LDCs", not for "duty-free and quota-free market access for all least developed country products". The treatment of least developed country products would be decided during World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations, where all WTO members were represented.

58. **Mr. Aho-Glele** (Benin), speaking on behalf of the least developed countries, said that the United States had participated in both the WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha and the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in Brussels. Moreover, extensive negotiations had been held with the United States — both in the Economic and Social Council and during the General Assembly's current session — during which the United States had insisted on using the language agreed at the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. His delegation wanted to know the real reason for the constant attempts by the United States to re-open the debate and whether it was seeking to renegotiate commitments made at the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. If that were the case, which in his view would be a very dangerous development, his delegation would reserve the right to reject the language used in other documents adopted with the participation of the United States.

59. **Mr. van Loosdrecht** (Netherlands) said that the European Union would vote in favour of paragraph 12 of the draft resolution. The European Union was strongly committed to addressing the concerns of commodity-dependent developing countries and to providing duty-free and quota-free market access for all exports from least developed countries. In 2001, the European Union had introduced the "Everything But Arms" initiative to that effect. He encouraged developed countries that had not already done so — as well as developing countries in a position to do so — to provide duty- and quota-free access to all products originating from least developed countries. The European Union regretted that it had not been possible to reach a consensus on a document that reflected commitments made in Doha and Brussels.

60. **Mr. Mushy** (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation endorsed the statements made by the representatives of Benin and the United States. Paragraph 68 (h) of the Brussels Programme of Action called for an improvement in preferential market access for least developed countries by working towards the objective of duty-free and quota-free market access for all least developed country products and that such provisions would apply in the markets of developed countries. A reference was subsequently made to those improvements in paragraph 42 of the Doha Declaration. Paragraph 12 of the draft resolution was therefore in line with commitments agreed by all Member States in Brussels and Doha.

61. **Mr. Erwa** (Sudan) said that he endorsed the comments made by the representative of Benin. His delegation believed that it was very dangerous to renegotiate matters which had already been agreed in other forums. Moreover, he was concerned that such action would lead the Committee also to rethink its position on certain matters, setting a very dangerous precedent for the future.

62. *A recorded vote was held on paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.26/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile,

China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Canada, Israel.

62. *Paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 150 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.*

63. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 12. However, their understanding was that the paragraph in question, which used agreed language taken from paragraph 20 of General Assembly resolution 58/197 on international trade and development, was nothing more than a simple reaffirmation of commitments made in Doha and Brussels.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.26/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted.*

66. **Mr. Aho-Glele** (Benin), speaking on behalf of the least developed countries, thanked those delegations that had voted in favour of paragraph 12. He hoped that those delegations that had withheld their vote would rejoin the group in support of the most vulnerable segment of the international community.

Agenda item 90: Operational activities for development *(continued)*

(a) **Operational activities for development of the United Nations system** *(continued)* (A/59/135)

67. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the activities of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (A/59/175).

68. *It was so decided.*

(b) **Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system** *(continued)*

Draft resolutions on the triennial comprehensive policy review for development of the United Nations system (A/C.2/59/L.28 and L.63)

69. **Mr. Abreha** (Ethiopia), Rapporteur, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.63, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.28. He recommended adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. Several revisions should be noted. In preambular paragraph 6, the acronym "MDG" should appear after the words "Millennium Development Goals," and should then be used throughout the text in place of the full title. In addition, it should be referred to in a footnote each time it appeared, as with the first occurrence. A footnote should also be added to paragraph 19, reading: "From operative paragraph 2 of the Monterrey Consensus".

70. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.63, as orally revised, was adopted.*

71. **Mr. Al-Mahmoud** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the draft resolution contained elements of great importance for

the developing countries as a whole and for all those countries that stood to benefit from United Nations development cooperation. He was pleased by the emphasis on the need to increase donor resources to support country-level activities, especially in the least developed countries. One of the main messages of the draft resolution was the inclusiveness of the United Nations system, a crucial condition for ensuring the implementation of the Millennium Declaration and the results of other global conferences and summits. The objectives of such undertakings were very ambitious, and required the participation of the entire international community and of all Governments. The draft resolution envisaged actions that looked towards 2007, the year of the next triennial policy review.

72. **Ms. Tamlyn** (United States of America) said that the draft resolution provided useful guidance to the United Nations operational development system; her delegation also welcomed the new section on transition from relief to development. The implementation of the resolution should make United Nations operational activities for development more effective instruments by supporting developed and developing countries in working together to reduce poverty. The United States would like to clarify that, in joining the consensus, it understood the term "right to development" to mean that each individual should enjoy the right to develop his or her intellectual or other capabilities to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of civil and political rights.

73. The United States also affirmed that it did not accept international aid targets based on percentages of donor GNP. Aid should, in its view, be increased to developing countries that had made a demonstrated commitment to governing justly, investing in their people, and promoting enterprise and entrepreneurship.

74. The assertion that developing countries should have access to new and emerging technologies contained in paragraph 32 of the draft, failed to recognize that researchers and investors developed technological systems on a proprietary basis. Technology transfers could not be mandated by the General Assembly, but required mutual agreements establishing the terms of such transfers. An investment climate providing legal protections for investors could help to attract technology-based investments. Her Government regretted that many Member States had been unwilling to incorporate language into the draft resolution acknowledging that fact.

75. *Draft resolution A/C.2/59/L.28 was withdrawn.*

Organization of work

76. **Mr. Leglise-Costa** (France) said he commended the translation services for providing the draft resolutions in all the official languages, greatly enhancing the Committee's ability to conduct its work.

77. **Mr. El-Farnawany** (Egypt) said that he too appreciated the availability of all documents in all of the official languages. One of the draft resolutions, however, had not been available in Arabic. He had not objected to its adoption, but that should not constitute a precedent.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.